REMARKS

In response to the final Office Action dated January 6, 2006, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-33 remain pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 9, 17, 22 and 25 are amended; and dependent claims 26-33 are added.

Pending claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-15 and 17-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,191,613 (Graziano et al.), in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,885,777 (Takaragi et al.), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,988,209 (Davidson et al.). Dependent claims 3, 11, 12 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Graziano et al. patent, the Takaragi et al. patent, and the Davidson et al. patent, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,868,877 (Fischer). Dependent claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Graziano et al. patent, the Takaragi et al. patent, the Davidson et al. patent, the Fischer patent, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,424,526 (Leonhardt et al.). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have disclosed computer implemented methods of handling stored electronic original objects compatible with any of the published electronic signature standards, cryptography, rules, regulations and statutes that govern electronic transactions

Applicants have disclosed a computer implemented method of handling stored electronic original objects that have been created by signing information objects by respective transfer agents. The disclosed methods support creation, control and maintenance of a legally enforceable electronic authoritative copy that may be a transferable record or negotiable instrument. There can be only one

electronic stored record that is deemed to be the authoritative copy, which stored copy can only exist under the control of a Trusted Custodial Utility (TCU). Said authoritative copy and its custody transfer when a change of location is authorized by the owner.

For example, as exemplified in Fig. 7, Applicants have disclosed that a TCU can validate an owner's right to add a record type (block 712) and confirm the owner as a valid TCU user (block 708). If this validation and confirmation is successful, the TCU applies (block 724) a new wrapper that includes a current date and time and a TCU's digital signature and certificate, i.e., the TCU transforms the record into an electronic original (e-original) object (specification at page 41, lines 27-34). The date and time can represent the moment that an electronic original object is created and the TCU's assumption of control. The electronic original object is stored as an authoritative copy (block 726), and if the submission replaces an existing electronic original object, then the new version supersedes the prior version and is made the authoritative copy (specification at page 42, lines 1 and 2).

The specific features are broadly encompassed by Applicants' independent claims (claims 1, 22 and 25). For example, claim 1 recites a computer implemented method of handling stored electronic original objects that have been created by signing information objects by respective transfer agents, submitting signed information objects to a trusted custodial utility (TCU), validating the submitted signed information objects by at least testing the integrity of the contents of each signed information object and the validity of the signature of the respective transfer agent, and applying to each validated information object a date-time stamp and a digital signature and authentication certificate of the TCU, which handles at least one

electronic original object based on rules established by an owner of the at least one electronic original object, comprising the steps of: establishing at least one type of electronic original object; enabling at least one selected user to access at least one selected type of electronic original object; identifying at least one type of electronic original object required to conclude a deal; and controlling transformation of a selected electronic original object into a transferable record, a new wrapper being applied to the selected electronic original object for storage by the TCU, the new wrapper comprising a date-time stamp, a digital signature and authentication certificate of the TCU to establish a unique authoritative storage copy.

As disclosed by the Applicants, and encompassed by claim 22, for the purpose of conveying an impaired copy to a user, a data structure can be formed from an extracted information such that upon rendering the content the information is properly placed with respect to the content and includes at least one forgery-resistant indicium to clearly identify the rendered information as a copy (specification at page 11, lines 9-12). However, the data structure communicated to the user merely represents an impaired version which is distinguishable from the unique authoritative storage copy.

The Graziano et al. patent discloses document authentication apparatus providing document authentication and authenticity capability. As disclosed by the Graziano et al. patent, document authentication requires that a user apply an authenticating mark on a document indicating intent to authenticate the document. Further, as disclosed by the Graziano et al. patent, a program checks the identity of a transmitted document at the transmitting and receiving station by comparison (Abstract). Accordingly, the Graziano et al. patent teaches document authentication

in a short-lived EDI transmission environment for end-to-end transmission integrity, as initiated by a user and authenticated by each end user. As such, "[f]or security purposes, the standard business practice of storing multiple copies can be used by any or all of the contracting parties" (col. 14, lines 21-24). The Graziano et al. patent is therefore not directed to solving the problem of establishing a unique authoritative storage copy of a selected electronic original object. The Graziano et al. patent does not teach or suggest "controlling transformation of a selected electronic original object into a transferable record, a new wrapper being applied to the selected electronic original object for storage by the TCU, the new wrapper comprising a date-time stamp, a digital signature and authentication certificate of the TCU to establish a unique authoritative storage copy," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 22 and 25.

The Takaragi et al. patent does not cure the deficiencies of the Graziano et al. patent. The Takaragi et al. patent was applied for its disclosure of "he/she adds a grace period date for the electronic seal and tally impression at a predetermined position on the certificate data" (col. 7, lines 20-23). However, the Takaragi et al. patent does not teach or suggest "controlling transformation of a selected electronic original object into a transferable record, a new wrapper being applied to the selected electronic original object for storage by the TCU, the new wrapper comprising a date-time stamp, a digital signature and authentication certificate of the TCU to establish a unique authoritative storage copy," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 22 and 25.

The Davidson et al. patent does not cure the deficiencies of the Graziano et al. patent and the Takaragi et al. patent. The Davidson et al. patent was applied for

its disclosure of "[t]he information entered in the Call Log includes a date and time stamp of current time, the station number derived in block 412, the called number obtained in block 464, the call reference value, and an indication that this is the start of an outgoing call" (col. 7, lines 41-47). The Davidson et al. patent clearly relates to a call processing, but the Davidson et al. patent does not teach or suggest, "controlling transformation of a selected electronic original object into a transferable record, a new wrapper being applied to the selected electronic original object for storage by the TCU, the new wrapper comprising a date-time stamp, a digital signature and authentication certificate of the TCU to establish a unique authoritative storage copy," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 22 and 25.

The Fischer patent does not cure the deficiencies of the Graziano et al. patent, the Takaragi et al. patent, and the Davidson et al. patent. The Fischer patent discloses a public key cryptographic system that conveys qualifications in an authentication certificate and enforces the qualifications. Its use of a signature blank is conventional. (Col. 11, lines 45-53; Col. 12, line 65 to Col. 13, line 8.). However, the Fischer patent does not teach or suggest "controlling transformation of a selected electronic original object into a transferable record, a new wrapper being applied to the selected electronic original object for storage by the TCU, the new wrapper comprising a date-time stamp, a digital signature and authentication certificate of the TCU to establish a unique authoritative storage copy," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 22 and 25.

The Leonhardt et al. patent does not cure the deficiencies of the Graziano et al. patent, the Takaragi et al. patent, the Davidson et al. patent, and the Fischer patent. The Leonhardt et al. patent discloses a system that includes a high data

density label to identify and manage objects. The labels are attached to goods and can be scanned optically. Its use of "metadata" is irrelevant to the present invention. Indeed, Leonhardt et al. uses the term "metadata" generically for summary data. It teaches away from the present invention by its desired use of physical data cartridges (col. 1, lines 54-60). Further, the Leonhardt et al. patent does not teach or suggest "controlling transformation of a selected electronic original object into a transferable record, a new wrapper being applied to the selected electronic original object for storage by the TCU, the new wrapper comprising a date-time stamp, a digital signature and authentication certificate of the TCU to establish a unique authoritative storage copy," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 22 and 25.

Even if combined, the Graziano et al. patent, the Takaragi et al. patent, the Davidson et al. patent, the Fischer patent, and/or the Leonhardt et al. patent, individually or in combinations as suggested by the Examiner, do not teach or suggest "controlling transformation of a selected electronic original object into a transferable record, a new wrapper being applied to the selected electronic original object for storage by the TCU, the new wrapper comprising a date-time stamp, a digital signature and authentication certificate of the TCU to establish a unique authoritative storage copy," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 22 and 25.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that these obviousness rejections are based on an improper hindsight reconstruction of the presently claimed invention from isolated disclosures in unrelated references. The Graziano et al. patent, the Takaragi et al. patent, the Davidson et al. patent, the Fischer patent and the

Leonhardt et al. patent are not in any way concerned with transferable records or authoritative copies. Without Applicants' disclosure, one of ordinary skill would not be motivated to combine those isolated disclosures. Withdrawal of the rejections is earnestly solicited.

Thus, independent claims 1, 22 and 25 are allowable over the applied references. The remaining claims depend from the aforementioned independent claims and recite additional advantageous features which further distinguish over the documents relied upon by the Examiner. As such, these claims are also considered allowable.

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: March 6, 2006

By: _____
Richard J. Kim
Registration No. 48,360

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620